

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the treatment is therapeutic as opposed to prophylactic. This amendment should dispose of the one outstanding substantive rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 1. Formal amendments have also been made to claim 1 in response to the Examiner's requests.

Claim 2 has been amended to clarify its scope. Applicants are assuming that the Examiner's objection resides in the failure of the claim to recite the number of carbons included in the substituents. Also "phenoxy" has been deleted as not within the scope of claim 1.

Commas have been added to the remaining claims as requested.

Applicants are not certain whether the Examiner is of the view that claims 3-5, 7-9 and 11-17 were canceled. They have not been canceled as the restriction requirement was to an election of species. Applicants understand that if a generic claim to the elected species is found allowable, the remaining species are to be examined and included as well. This was pointed out in the Response filed 23 June 2008. Claims 3-5, 7-9 and 11-17 were merely withdrawn from consideration in light of this election. It is assumed that they are now rejoined.

The amendments suggested to the specification have been made as have the amendments suggested under "claim objections."

As noted above, the amendment to claim 1 disposes of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as enablement for treatment of a condition (*i.e.*, therapeutic treatment) is acknowledged.

Apparently, appropriate terminal disclaimers have been filed and accepted and there is no outstanding double-patenting rejection. Thus, it appears claims 1-17 are in a position for allowance and passage of these claims to issue is respectfully requested.

